

Keystone Harbor Study Public Involvement and Public Comment Summary

January 7, 2005



Prepared by:



EnviroIssues

Purpose

Washington State Ferries (WSF) received public comments in conjunction with the Keystone Harbor Study process from June through December 2004. Comments were submitted by mail or email and were provided verbally during public comment periods at the conclusion of each Keystone Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meeting. WSF Customer and Community Relations staff responded to inquiries and comments throughout the process as appropriate. WSF provided written and electronic comments in handout form at several CAG meetings.

See CAG meeting materials for public comment handouts. Individual CAG meeting summaries include summaries of comments given during public comment periods at all CAG meetings.

Methods for Commenting

WSF offered the following methods for members of the public to respond to the CAG process and Keystone Harbor Study:

Email: keystone-ptproject@wsdot.wa.gov, and keystoneharborstudy@wsdot.wa.gov

By Letter: WSF; Attn: Keystone Harbor Study; 2911 2nd Ave; Seattle, WA 98121

By Phone: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations, 206-515-3411

In person at CAG Meetings: A 15-minute open comment period was offered at the conclusion of each CAG meeting

Summary of Comments Received

WSF received more than 50 comments over the course of the Keystone Harbor Study. Comment topics included costs of harbor/vessel scenarios, traffic on both sides of the route, schedule, and environmental impacts. Examples of different comments are noted below. Full text of written comments is attached to this appendix; oral comments presented at CAG meetings are summarized in CAG meeting summaries.

On Overall Terminal and Vessel Improvements:

“The route as it now is causes unnecessary backups and delays for many people traveling to the Peninsula. The boats are aged and at some point will become unsafe. Now is the time to go for the bigger boats and a new location to accommodate travelers using this popular route to the Peninsula.”

“We would be very sad to see the terminal enlarged with the resultant environmental problems. It seems to fit in with the topography of the area nestled in that cove, which even though it services the ferries, is still relatively unpolluted.”

“Now that I have moved to Whidbey Island after 22 years in Port Townsend, I am surprised and appalled at the level of service between the island and Port Townsend, particularly in the summer months when hordes of tourists are attracted by advertising and feature articles describing the activities available in both places.”

On Costs:

“It is shortsighted to not standardize because you have to keep things running all the time, and that costs money.”

“The lowest price vessel shown at the September 30 meeting was \$11 million dollars lower than the highest price vessel, which is the Issaquah 130 vessel. That option still requires a second 130 in 2030 to accommodate traffic, increasing the overall scenario price tag.”

On Traffic and Schedule:

“I am concerned that the driving force behind WSF is the 130-class ferry. I think it will kill Port Townsend and Coupeville because you will have restaurants that are either packed or empty at any given time. ...[I]f you look at it in terms of schedule, you kill these tourist towns. “

“Route all incoming and exiting traffic to Route 20, not via Camp Casey, Engle Road, and South Main Street. Engle Road is part of the heart of Ebey’s Landing Historical Reserve. As such, we should try as much as possible to keep the feel of it rural. Huge pulses of noisy traffic coming through multiple times a day are eroding that rural feeling. Likewise, all that traffic coming through South Main Street on the way north clogs south Coupeville and really does not help the businesses in that area, since extremely few people stop. In addition, all that traffic and the schools in the south Coupeville area are not a good mix.”

Written Comments Received During CAG Process

COMMENT

Date: May 28, 2004
Author: Jeff Randall
By: Email

Thank you for the email on the public process WSDOT is following for the Keystone terminal improvements.

Will the Citizen Advisory Group analyze any proposed improvements on the Port Townsend side of the run (expanded ferry terminal, relocated parking, etc.)? Or, is the CAG only reviewing the change in location on the Whidbey side?

If the CAG is only reviewing the Whidbey side, who is working on the Port Townsend side improvement? Please keep me in the loop as further developments occur or if you have any questions.

Jeff Randall
City of Port Townsend
Office of Building & Community Development

COMMENT

Date: May 28, 2004
Author: Marianne Edain, Whidbey Environmental Action Network
By: Email

Keystone - PT Project people:

We appreciate being apprised of the upcoming meeting, and of the existence of the Advisory Group. We do have a few questions.

1. Would you please provide us with a roster of all the Group members, what agency or organization they represent, and how they were chosen?
2. Would you please provide us with the declared task of this Group and what the final work product is expected to be?
3. Would you please provide us with a proposed budget for the expenditure of the \$1 million appropriated by the legislature?
4. Would you please explain the relationship between the existence of the Group, the expected work product of the Group, and the expenditure of the \$1 million?

It would be helpful if we had this information before the June 7 meeting.

Thank you for your help. Marianne Edain

WSF RESPONSE

Date: May 28, 2004
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Marianne, Here are the answers to your questions regarding the CAG. I'm also attaching a copy of the legislation directing WSF to form the CAG and perform the harbor analysis, as well as a copy of the agenda for the first meeting.

1. Would you please provide us with a roster of all the Group members, what agency or organization they represent, and how they were chosen?

The advisory group is composed of representatives determined by the Washington State Legislature, including one Washington State ferry pilot (Captain Tim McGuire); two regular users of the route (Mayor Nancy Conard and Forest Shomer); and one tug pilot (Captain Clark Jennison). A Secretary of Transportation appointee will also be present at the CAG meetings. The Washington State Transportation Commission officially appointed CAG members at their April 2004 meeting. (Please see attached legislative direction.)

2. Would you please provide us with the declared task of this Group and what the final work product is expected to be?

Please see attached legislation. You can find the full March 2004 Legislative supplemental budget at http://leap.leg.wa.gov/leap/Budget/Detail/2004/T2004Bill_0311.pdf. The expected product is a report to the Legislative Transportation Committee due on December 1, 2004.

3. Would you please provide us with a proposed budget for the expenditure of the \$1 million appropriated by the legislature?

The budget has not been decided yet - we will have a better idea of the budget after the second CAG meeting. The agenda for the first meeting is attached.

4. Would you please explain the relationship between the existence of the Group, the expected work product of the Group, and the expenditure of the \$1 million?

Please see attached legislation.

Let me know if you have further questions or would like some more information.

Celia Schorr

COMMENT

Date: May 28, 2004
Author: Robin Adams
By: Email

Thank you for this information.

At the last meeting on Whidbey Island, the WSF representatives stated that the basic reason we needed a new harbor for the Keystone-Pt Townsend ferry was that the WSF had decided to standardize on the Issaquah 130 class boats, and these could not fit into the existing harbor.

I assume that this decision was based on an analysis of the different options that existed and that some kind of study was made to support the conclusion.

I have the following questions:

(1) Was this study made public and, if so, how can I obtain a copy?

- (2) If not, is there any reason why I could not obtain a copy from you by reimbursing your reasonable copying costs?
(3) Has WSF actually ordered the 4 large boats in question and if so, when will they be delivered?

It would be very helpful to know the answer to these questions before the meetings.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Robin Adams

WSF RESPONSE

Date: June 05, 2004
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Mr. Adams,

I got your voicemail message when I got back into the office on Tuesday. I did return the call and left a message at your office - I understand you've been out of the country.

There has never been a study regarding the retirement of the Steel Electrics. WSF made the decision to retire the four Steel Electric vessels based on budget and timing considerations, and the fact that they are operationally obsolete and do not meet the needs of the system. The vessels were last renovated in the early - mid 1980s and are due for major renovation within the next seven to ten years. If the vessels were to be kept in operation, WSF is faced with spending approximately \$75 million over a ten-year period to keep the Steel Electrics in good operational condition. This makes no sense in light of the fact that the 76-year old vessels do not meet ferry system standards or needs, much less the future needs of the system.

After deciding to retire the Steel Electrics, WSF looked at how best to replace the four vessels. WSF decided that a mid-sized vessel, that would be interchangeable throughout the entire WSF system, made the most sense considering cost-effectiveness and system-wide utility. A 130-car sized vessel fills that need.

Regarding your question about the new vessel procurement. WSF is still in the design stage and has just begun the process of identifying the shipyard that will be hired to construct the new vessels. The first vessel is scheduled for delivery in 2008.

Also, I did want to take this opportunity to clarify the process that we are embarking on now in regards to the Keystone Project. The legislature has instructed WSF to perform an analysis of the viability of Keystone Harbor for future operation of the Keystone-Port Townsend route. This analysis includes the formation of a Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG), which will be consulting with the project team throughout the summer. The CAG will assist the team in putting together a final report on the analysis, which is due to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

The first meeting of the CAG is taking place this Monday, June 7. The public is welcome to attend. I've attached a copy of the agenda and directions to the meeting.

Hopefully I've answered your questions. Let me know if you need any further information.

Thanks
Celia Schorr
Corporate Communications
Washington State Ferries
(206) 515-3918
schorrc@wsdot.wa.gov

COMMENT

Date: June 07, 2004
Author: Robin Adams
By: Email

Thank you for this reply. Indeed I am away and will not be at the first meeting, though I understand there will be other meetings which I hope to attend.

I do have one point which I am asking you to clarify. You state:

"WSF looked at how best to replace the four vessels. WSF decided that a mid-sized vessel, that would be interchangeable throughout the entire WSF system, made the most sense considering cost-effectiveness and system-wide utility. A 130-car sized vessel fills that need."

In order to determine that a 130-car sized vessel was the most cost effective, WSF must have examined a variety of other alternatives. Otherwise how could WSF decide that this vessel type was best? What I am trying to

find out is the following:

- (a) what alternatives did WSF actually study ?
- (b) what were the financial implications of these alternatives ?

I find it quite hard to believe that WSF (or any company for that matter) could make a decision of such large financial implications without some kind of formal analysis of options.

I am certain that some written document must exist somewhere that justifies this decision. I am hoping you can help me identify it.

Yours sincerely
Robin G Adams

WSF RESPONSE

Date: June 10, 2004
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Robin - I'll see what I can find for you and get back to you as soon as possible. Also, the second CAG meeting is scheduled for June 24th in Coupeville - the exact location hasn't been finalized.

Thanks,

Celia Schorr
Corporate Communications
Washington State Ferries
(206) 515-3918
schorrc@wsdot.wa.gov

COMMENT

Date: June 11, 2004
Author: Ken Dickey
By: Email

Here is a simple, inexpensive strategy to reduce driver stress/complaints on the Port Townsend side of the ferry.

When the lot fills, use a portable ticket receipt which contains a sequence number in addition to the date. The receipt should also have a list of sailing times -- the times when cars will next move.

Go along the line of cars and pre-sell tickets. The only time the driver is required is after each ferry has loaded. The the cars can stream into the lot rather than doing so incrementally. The only time the "stream" has to move is just when a vessil sails.

At the time of sale, it would be good to inform the driver of the estimated departure time for his car. When vehicles are "batched" into the lot, indicating the estimated number of ferry loadings before it departs.

Having sequence numbers also removes problems for large vehicles (e.g. delivery trucks) which may "appear" to load out-of order. Such vehicles can be driven into the lot and load with their sequence group.

\$0.02

-Ken Dickey

COMMENT

Date: June 14, 2004
Author: Barbara Kolar
By: Email

I saw the notice for the first CAG meeting after the fact and so was not able to make it. Will you please provide me with the minutes of that meeting and notice for the next meeting. Thank you,
Barbara Kolar

COMMENT

Date: June 24, 2004
Author: Jerry Shimek
By: Email

Dear Sirs,

I am happy to see you are meeting on this issue. Recent press reports led me to believe that the project was dead.

This run is very important. It needs to be modernized for safety as well as efficiency. Vehicles waiting on back streets of Port Townsend as well as well north of Fort Casey while antiquated, by anyone's definition, increasingly unsafe boats navigate tricky currents, smothering fogs and the narrow harbor entry at Keystone. The public deserves better.

Environmental issues definitely need to be addressed. The lake, various plant species, and homeowners' views are among the issues that need resolution, and issues that need to be resolved. But no one or no one group can simply, "lock up the Island" as their private "bailiwick".

Most vehicle traffic is simply passing through. Larger capacity vessels will limit the impact on our roads by possibly running on a revised schedule with fewer crossings. Keep in mind, most summer traffic visitors spend money on the Island. In winter, reduce the runs as currently practiced.

The run is more than a mere convenience. It is an integral part of our highway system and should no more be eliminated than another public highway. I have been riding on this run for over 60 years.

Our Island continues to evolve and change. Let's manage changes in a careful way that benefits everyone.

Please keep me informed.

Sincerely,
Jerry Shimek

WSF RESPONSE

Date: June 24, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Jerry,
Thank you for your comments. Today, is our second meeting of the Citizen Advisory Group at the Fort Casey Conference Center (Auditorium B) from 5:30-8:45pm. I am sending you a link to the project web page where you can find the agenda and meeting materials from our first meeting on June 7, 2004. I have attached to this email the agenda for this evening's meeting (directions on reverse). Please let me know, if you have any questions.

http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/improvement_projects/ptkey/

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg
Washington State Ferries
2911 2nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98121
(206) 515-3411
Fax (206) 515-3404

COMMENT

Date: June 30, 2004
Author: Jill Satran, Washington State House of Representatives House Transportation Committee
By: Email

Hi! I had to miss the last Keystone CAG meeting. Could I get copies of the materials that were handed out? Also, do you know when the next meeting(s) are scheduled? Thanks for all your help!!

Regards,

Jill Satran, Counsel
Washington House of Representatives
House Transportation Committee
360.786.7315
Satran_Ji@leg.wa.gov

COMMENT

Date: July 01, 2004
Author: Lawson Bronson
By: Email

Gentlemen:

Please include me on your mailing and Email list.

I would like to attend these meetings

Lawson Bronson

COMMENT

Date: July 01, 2004
Author: Robin Adams
By: Email

In the past you have kindly assisted me with some information related to the above.

Although I was not able to attend the most recent meeting, I noted that you were there and would like to ask for your recollection as to what happened.

I understand that there was an extended discussion about the proper size of vessel for this run. According to notes that have been given to me Captain Tim McGuire said that "4 new boats are already in the process". On the other hand you recently told me that WSF was still "in the design stage" and has "just begun the process of identifying the shipyard".

My question is this: has WSF already committed itself to purchasing these boats?

It seems the answer must be no and therefore that the Captain was referring to some kind of preliminary approval to do the design work.

I hope you will be able to confirm that this is the case.

Do you know yet when the next meetings are to be scheduled?

Robin G Adams

WSF RESPONSE

Date: July 11, 2004
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Robin, Sorry for the delay - I just got swamped! WSF is committed to designing and purchasing four new 130-car vessels. We are in the process of preliminary design and selecting a shipyard to build these vessels. The new vessels are needed for the system as a whole.

The legislature has approved the purchase and the funding sources have been identified. The design and build process for a project of this magnitude is long and complex. By the time WSF issues the Request for Proposals (RFP), the basic outline of the vessel must already be determined.

The discussion at the last CAG (Citizen Advisory Group) meeting was about which studies to conduct as part of the report on Keystone Harbor. As part of that discussion, the CAG talked about what type of vessel-size and type to include as part of the study. My sense from the last CAG meeting is that the study will look at several options for operating out of Keystone Harbor, including the use of different vessel types and different harbor configurations. This is consistent with the direction from the legislature. (As you know, the environmental review process that WSF had been engaged in was halted and the legislature directed us to conduct a study focused solely on Keystone Harbor, in consultation with the Citizen's Advisory Group.)

We are planning the next CAG meeting for 7/29, but do not have the location set yet. The schedule for all upcoming meetings will be finalized at the next CAG meeting, and I'll be sure to get these dates to you once they're set.

Hopefully this all made sense! If not, feel free to call or write.

Thanks,

Celia Schorr

Celia Schorr
Public Education and Outreach Manager
Washington State Ferries
Voice: 206-515-3918
Pgr: 206- 955-4263
Fax: 206-515-3404
schorrc@wsdot.wa.gov

COMMENT

Date: July 05, 2004
Author: Caleb Key
By: Email

Dear Keystone Citizen Advisory Group,

My name is Caleb Kay, and I am a 24-year-old office assistant at a non-profit organization in Seattle, WA. I recently visited the Keystone ferry terminal during a trip from Bellingham to Port Angeles, for tourist activities while on a short vacation. I wanted to let you know I think it is wonderful you are considering improving it.

I found the terminal adequate, and it served its purpose. There was a scenic view and a snack bar, nearby. Although the snack bar was rustic, and I assume it was not affiliated with Washington State Ferries, it added a rural charm to the place. The turnaround should be built closer to the terminal, however - it was a bit confusing. A paved walkway to a scenic viewpoint might also be considered.

The ferry itself was on time, and everything seemed to run very efficiently. I noticed at least 20 to 25 other cars, not to mention passengers, utilized the ferry. This was around 10 AM on June 18. I hope this ferry route will not be discontinued. It was an extremely beautiful ride, with the Olympic Mountains in the distance, and I'm sure it gets much use during the tourist season. Improve the conditions, and I'm sure it will get even more use.

Thank you for your time,
Caleb Kay

WSF RESPONSE

Date: July 06, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Caleb,
Thank you for your comments. I will add you to the e-mail list to keep you informed as the project moves forward. Right now, the environmental review process is "on hold" as we further study Keystone Harbor

with guidance from a Citizen Advisory Group. For the latest information, please visit the project website at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/improvement_projects/ptkey/

Sincerely,

Joy Goldenberg
Washington State Ferries
2911 2nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98121
(206) 515-3411
cell (206) 713-7907
Fax (206) 515-3404

COMMENT

Date: July 08, 2004
Author: Fred Ulf
By: Email

We BADLY need a new location for the terminal and especially a location that would allow the use of larger boats. I understand the NIMBY attitude of those living close to the site or the proposed new terminal but so it goes - isn't this a case of the greater good for the many vs. protecting the "rights" of the privileged few fortunate to live on the water there. I would gladly trade the "interruption" and inconvenience of a waterfront home and the chance to watch the ferry traffic come and go to living in the cramped urban environs that many of us do.

The route as it now is causes unnecessary backups and delays for many people traveling to the peninsula. The boats are aged and at some point will become unsafe. Now is the time to go for the bigger boats and a new location to accommodate travelers using this popular route to the Peninsula.

My .02 cents.

Fred Ulf
Arlington, WA

WSF RESPONSE

Date: July 09, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Mr. Ulf,

Thank you for your comments. I will add you to the e-mail list to keep you informed as the project moves forward. Right now, the environmental review process is "on hold" as we further study Keystone Harbor with guidance from a Citizen Advisory Group. For the latest information, please visit the project website at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/improvement_projects/ptkey/

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg
Washington State Ferries
2911 2nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98121
(206) 515-3411
cell (206) 713-7907
Fax (206) 515-3404

COMMENT

Date: July 12, 2004
Author: Robin Adams
By: Email

Thanks for this information.

COMMENT

Date: July 16, 2004
Author: Jim Craig
By: Email

Hello

We are a longreach trachoe service company. Our machines can reach out there 73'and can excavate down 45'.

We can work offshore as well as land. I'll be in your area soon and was asking if there was a demand for my type of work.

Thanks

JIM CRAIG

WSF RESPONSE

Date:
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Mr. Craig,

Thank you for your inquiry. Please be advised that construction on this project is years away. WSF has tabled the environmental review process and is working with an advisory group to look at options within Keystone Harbor for the Keystone Terminal. I have forwarded your comment to the project manager for future reference.

Sincerely,

Joy Goldenberg

COMMENT

Date: July 31, 2004
Author: Gary Wheeler
By: Email

Dear Sirs,

We own a home east of the Keystone Ferry Dock, and want to stay informed on the revision project.

We read that current plans are focused entirely on enlarging the existing Keystone Harbor facility.

Alternative sites have momentarily been set aside. Our question is: Is this because of environmental concerns over disturbing the existing Underwater Marine Park located next the existing harbor?

Thanks kindly,

Gary Wheeler

WSF RESPONSE

Date: August 2, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Mr. Wheeler,

Thank you for the e-mail. In response to public concern over relocation options for Keystone Terminal, the State Legislature halted work on the environmental review process in March 2004. It appropriated \$1 million for Washington State Ferries to conduct a technical analysis to determine the viability of the existing Keystone Harbor. This phase of work includes formation of a Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) to help guide the analysis. The underwater marine park was mentioned in public comments during scoping for the environmental review process, as were other possible environmental impacts, but it was not the sole reason for the project being put 'on hold' while the analysis of Keystone Harbor is conducted.

We will add you to the project e-mail and mailing list. This ensures that you will receive updates on the project and meeting announcements for the Keystone CAG. You may also check the project webpage for the latest information at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/improvement_projects/ptkey/

We appreciate your e-mail.

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg

COMMENT

Date: August 06, 2004
Author: Peter Holden
By: Email

To the Committee studying the Keystone Ferry Terminal

Dear Committee Members:

We have owned a cottage in Brinnon, WA for 11 years and prior to that we camped on the Peninsula for 10 years. We love the drive down Whidbey Island and the ferry terminal area. If we have to wait for a ferry because the capacity of the ferry is too small, or the phases of the moon dictate a cancellation, we take wonderful walks up on the grassy banks overlooking the ocean or play on the beach or on the Port Townsend side we walk through town and step back in time. The tourism dollars generated in this area are done so precisely because of this slow, lazy, relaxed and old-fashioned charm of both sides of the ferry route.

We would be very sad to see the terminal enlarged with the resultant environmental problems. It seems to fit in with the topography of the area nestled in that cove, which even though it services the ferries, is still relatively unpolluted. An expansion of any kind would ruin the step back in time beauty of this area. In our neck of the woods the government has expanded Horseshoe Bay ferry terminal to accommodate larger ferries and this once beautiful cove is now a polluted, paved nightmare of efficiency. We used to picnic in this cove when it had small ferries and it was beautiful. Now, all you want to do is stay in your car and pray that the ferry gets you out of there as soon as possible.

We think you should consider building ferries that will fit the existing harbour and terminal. Why not tailor the ferries to the location instead of altering or amending the location for the accommodation of larger ferries.

Everywhere societies are pushed into BIGGER which we are told translates into better only to find we have lost something somewhere along the way

(I think it's called quality of life). The Keystone/Port Townsend route is an anachronism that is too precious to tamper with.

Respectfully and hopefully submitted by,
Kathleen Stringer
Peter Holden
Bridget Stringer-Holden
Alexandra Stringer-Holden

COMMENT

Date: August 12, 2004
Author: Barbara Arnold
By: Email

Now that I have moved to Whidbey Island after 22 years in Port Townsend, I am surprised and appalled at the level of service between the island and PT, particularly in the summer months when hordes of tourists are attracted by advertising and feature articles describing the activities available in both places.

Waits of two hours are the norm on many days -- often longer on weekends. (That's sitting in your car, in the sun, with no place to go for shade, a restroom, or a cool drink.) The ferries that serve this route are small, and frequently miss sailings because of mechanical or "crewing" issues.

On the Port Townsend side, visitors are often unpleasantly surprised to find that the final (8:30 p.m.) sailing to Keystone has been sold out for hours, and the next sailing isn't until 6:30 a.m. I suppose they can sleep in their cars, clutching the ticket that will permit them to progress to the ferry line sometime in the future.

Seems pretty rinky-dink for such a vibrant area to be hamstrung by such an inadequate transportation option. Is anyone besides me concerned about this?

Barbara Arnold
Freeland
Whidbey Island

WSF RESPONSE

Date: August 12, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Ms. Arnold,
Thank you for your comment. We will add you to the project e-mail and mailing lists. I encourage you to attend the upcoming Keystone Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meetings - August 26, September 30, October 13, and October 28. All of the meetins are held at Coupeville Rec Hall from 5:30-8:45 pm. I have also attached a copy of our most recent newsletter about the Keystone CAG process. If you experience difficulty opening the attachment, please provide me with your mailing address and I will send a hardcopy.

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg
Washington State Ferries
2911 2nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98121
(206) 515-3411
cell (206) 713-7907
Fax (206) 515-3404

COMMENT

Date: August 16, 2004
Author: Michael Davis
By: Email

please put me on the keystone ferry projectlist I last rode it in 1984

COMMENT

Date: August 17, 2004
Author: Daniel Thompson
By: US Mail

Re: Keystone Ferry Terminal Project

Dear Mr. Shomer:

I have a house in Telakar Shores in Keystone. I was actively involved in the prior scoping process as well as representing the interests of our community in this matter. I am pleased to hear that you have been appointed to represent the interest of Whidbey Island, Coupeville, and the surrounding neighbors in this project. My wife is from Marrowstone Island and you may know my in-laws, Chuck and Karen Russell, owners of the Valley Tavern. They have indicated that they know you and speak highly of you.

It has been my opinion from the very beginning that WSF's process is flawed and is solely based on their design to go to one Issaquah class ferry for the Keystone-Port Townsend run. Luckily, before all the environmental review litigation began, we were successful in bringing this issue to the attention of Mary Margaret Haugen as well as my own state senator, Jim Horn, to have a more objective review of the process.

Enclosed are my scoping process letters dated December 22, 2003 and January 14, 2004. These letters in detail show what I believe to be the WSF's misinformation in their attempt to move the ferry terminal out of Keystone harbor as well as why the economic, environmental and community needs require two smaller ferries on this run.

I look forward to meeting you at the upcoming meetings. If you have any questions or if I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Yours Truly,
Daniel P. Thompson

DPT:cas
Enclosures

COMMENT

Date: August 17, 2004
Author: Daniel Thompson
By: US Mail

RE: Keystone Ferry Terminal Project

Dear Mayor Cunard:

I have a house in Telakar Shores in Keystone. I was actively involved in the prior scoping process as well as representing the interests of our community in this matter. I am pleased to hear that you have been

appointed to represent the interests of Whidbey Island, Coupeville, and the surrounding neighbors in this project.

It has been my opinion from the very beginning that WSF's process is flawed and is solely based on their design to go to one Issaquah class ferry for the Keystone-Port Townsend run. Luckily, before all the environmental review litigation began, we were successful in bringing this issue to the attention of Mary Margaret Haugen as well as my own state senator, Jim Horn, to have a more objective view of the process.

Enclosed are my scoping process letters dated December 22, 2003 and January 14, 2004. These letters in detail show what I believe to be the WSF's misinformation in their attempt to move the ferry terminal out of Keystone harbor as well as why the economic, environmental and community needs require two smaller ferries on this run.

I look forward to meeting you at the upcoming meetings. If you have any questions or if I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Yours truly,
Daniel P. Thompson

DPT: cas
enclosures

COMMENT

Date: August 23, 2004
Author: Will Jones
By: Email

Hello Celia

Could you tell me what the transit time is for a ferry to travel from Keystone to Port Townsend? Could you also tell me what the turn around time (unloading plus loading) time is at the Keystone dock for a full load of cars?

Thanks
Will

WSF RESPONSE

Date:
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Hi - I've been out of the office the past two days! Should be able to get you this info by the end of the day. I believe the crossing time is scheduled for 30 minutes, but am not sure about the unloading/loading time.

Celia Schorr
Public Education and Outreach Manager
Washington State Ferries
Voice: 206-515-3918
Pgr: 206- 955-4263
Fax: 206-515-3404
schorrc@wsdot.wa.gov

Will - The "dwell time" - time needed to unload and load - is 15 minutes on each side. Crossing time is 30 minutes. Also, tonight's CAG meeting will be shortened considerably - we just got word this morning that one of the CAG members (Clark Jennison, the tug boat pilot) will be stuck on the boat and cannot get to the

meeting. Mayor Nancy Conard has to leave after an hour (she had informed us of this a few weeks ago). So, in order to deal with the most important agenda items while we have a majority of CAG members present, we are consolidating the agenda. An e-mail alert is about to be sent out, but please share this info with anyone you can: Plan to arrive for tonight's meeting on time. The meeting will begin promptly at 5:30 and will end at 7:00.

See you tonight.

Thanks,

Celia Schorr
Public Education and Outreach Manager
Washington State Ferries
Voice: 206-515-3918
Pgr: 206- 955-4263
Fax: 206-515-3404
schorrc@wsdot.wa.gov

COMMENT

Date: August 26, 2004
Author: Robin Adams
By: Email

[ATTACHED: "Does the Ferry System Really Need a New Keystone Dock? An Economic Analysis," by R. Adams]

At the CAG meeting in Coupeville on August 26th, I presented a report which I prepared on the question as to whether or not WSF should be planning to move to larger boats on this route - triggering the need for this project.

Although I distributed several copies, I am not sure whether they were sufficient. I am therefore enclosing a copy in the form of a PDF file.

I ask you to verify that the members of the CAG have received a copy of this report and if they have not forward it to them I also request that you include this as part of the public record.

I confirm that I have no objection to your supplying this to any WSF staff that may be interested and/or to any member of the public who might request a copy.

Yours sincerely
Robin G Adams

COMMENT

Date: August 26, 2004
Author: Will Jones
By: Email

Hello Celia

I understand that the CAG meeting has been shortened because of the unavailability of CAG members. I have done some analysis of 4 sizes of ferries which has identified some problems which have never been discussed. All of this is on one chart and could take about 15 minutes to present. I would think that this would be of more interest to the Staff than to the CAG members at this point in time. I would hope that

could give me some time to present these comments before the meeting ends.

Will

COMMENT

Date: September 06, 2004
Author: Scott Landis and Kathleen Mitchell
By: Email

Hello D.O.T.

For the first time my wife and I were made aware of dots plans for a PT-Keystone run last Wednesday, Sept 1. from the Port Angeles peninsula paper. For some reason the local Port Townsend Leader missed the issue. At any rate our general public has not been previously informed and we want to assure you that there will be opposition to this proposal once it is aired.

We are a building owners in the downtown historic district and we totally oppose this expansion. Our fears are not centered on the impact to the tourist industry or for that matter economic issues. We are opposed to any effort to expand car traffic on our peninsula. If dot wants to help our community out give us a passenger only ferry with bicycle capability and make smaller car ferries. Be a leader in providing alternatives to cars for transportation. And please don't be fooled by the business community they do not speak for all of us. We deserve public hearings on any issues concerning expansion of roads or ferries in our town.

Sincerely,
Scott Landis and Kathleen Mitchell

WSF RESPONSE

Date: September 12, 2004
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Mr. Landis and Ms. Mitchell:

Thanks for your e-mail - I'll do my best to respond. The work being planned right now at the Pt. Townsend terminal is for preservation - major maintenance - of the facility. The in-water berthing structures at that terminal are badly in need of repair to keep the terminal operating. This project will not result in expanded traffic at the terminal.

There may be some confusion about the project, due to the earlier environmental review process that was underway for the entire route. During that process, WSF/WSDOT looked at alternatives on the Keystone side in order to use larger vessels on the route. At that time, WSF was also looking at changes to Port Townsend so the terminal could accommodate larger vessels.

However, due to legislative action during the last legislative session, that process is now on hold, while WSF studies options for continuing to operate out of Keystone harbor. (see http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/improvement_projects/ptkey/ for more details.)

But the repairs to Port Townsend cannot wait for the Keystone study to be finalized and subsequent follow-up action by the legislature (expected in Spring of 2005). So WSF is moving forward with repairs and maintenance at Pt. Townsend that will not preclude any vessel from using the facility. The slips will be moved further offshore, and the dock lengthened to allow any vessel to land there. In this way, the maintenance gets done, and the investment is well-spent, for any vessel size that may be used in the future.

The additional dock space will also have the benefit of getting car traffic off the street - a plus, regardless of what size boat is in the dock.

Hopefully this all makes sense! If not, feel free to contact us again.

Thanks,
Celia Schorr
Celia Schorr
Public Education and Outreach Manager
Washington State Ferries
206-515-3918

COMMENT

Date: September 27, 2004
Author: Will Jones
By: Email

Hello Celia
The Tug Boat captain has not shown up for any of the CAG meetings that I have attended. How much is the Ferry Department paying him to attend the meetings?
Thanks
Will

WSF RESPONSE

Date:
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Will,
Serving on the Keystone Citizen Advisory Group is a volunteer effort. Clark Jennison's work schedule has been unpredictable this summer, permitting him to attend only the first meeting in-person. However, we've been in touch with him before and after each meeting, and he has commented on materials and provided feedback, which we've shared with the CAG members in his absence (see June 30th CAG summary). We are working to get an alternate tug pilot for the next two meetings.
Thanks,
Celia

COMMENT

Date: October 04, 2004
Author: Ken Dickey
By: Email

=====

The following was supposed to have been sent several weeks ago,
but there was a mailer sw problem. Sorry.

=====

This summer I had to be out of state twice and it seems that a meeting was scheduled each time, so I'll give some input indirectly.

Given that we need to compare total costs of alternatives, I am skeptical that the "uniform fleet" proposal is best.

There are a number of advantages for purchasing two 65 or 75, (shallow draft, more maneuverable) car ferries.

One need not construct what I consider to be "deep water" ports. [I understand about the two types of money--sunk costs (bonds) vs operating costs (legislature). Port costs are part of the "sunk costs" of ferries].

- Smaller payloads are easier to process for security.
- Smaller ferries scale down

In winter low ridership conditions, smaller ferries travel more often (or at a cheaper operating cost) to give more frequent service (less wait time).

The 2nd ferry could be used on the San Juan run in place of the current, larger but underutilized (in Winter) ferry.

On low to medium demand cases, auto queues are shorter.

Smaller ferries scale up

One can delay buying 3rd "spare" for several years and do so when the ridership is demonstratively shown to be increasing (vs the current case of static to decreasing ridership).

Smaller ferries deliver smaller loads, decreasing traffic "pulses" and spreading out the traffic load on the roads.

One scales up (or down) in smaller cost/investment increments.

On the topic of safety, I certainly favor moving the dive park and boat launch.

As an alternative to dredging, perhaps the Keystone dock could be extended (what effect w.r.t. safe stoppage? Extend the jetty?)

Aside: as my undergraduate emphasis was hydrology, I do know enough to distrust ALL models, especially those involving turbulent (vs laminar) flow.

[I recall one case in aircraft design where there was a great deal of worry about turbulence. Three models were used, two computer models and one wind tunnel model. They all predicted the same results with very high accuracy.

The prototype plane was built. When it crashed on take-off, the models were reviewed to find a different, unrelated flaw in each].

I do apologize for missing next week's meeting.

\$0.02,

-Ken Dickey

WSF RESPONSE

Date: October 26, 2004

Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations

By: Email

Mr. Dickey,

Thank you for your comments. WSF is currently conducting additional analyses for all options being considered for Keystone Harbor including comparing the costs of each option. This information will be presented at a future Keystone CAG meeting, which I hope you will be able to attend.

I will make sure you are added to the project mailing list so you will receive meeting announcements and project updates.

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg

COMMENT

Date: October 13, 2004

Author: Alma Taylor
By: Email

Sir/Madam:

I am not able to get to the meeting this evening but have the following comment:

Enlargement of the ferry terminal may well service more cars/passengers, but at whose cost?

Port Townsend already lacks sufficient parking. Its streets are crowded and uncomfortable during tourist season. The town simply doesn't have the size and facilities to handle more traffic, vehicular or foot. The ferry area would be turned into one large parking lot -not unlike what the Port has done down at Point Hudson.

It seems that the main benefit from enlarging the terminal would be felt by retailers.

I appreciate your including these comments in your decision-making.

Sincerely,
A. Taylor

WSF RESPONSE

Date: October 26, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Ms. Taylor,

Thank you for your comment. Currently, WSF is looking at options for keeping the Keystone Terminal in Keystone Harbor. This analysis includes looking at traffic impacts around Keystone. Traffic impacts to Port Townsend will be studied as part of the Port Townsend Terminal Preservation Project. This project is separate and distinct from the Keystone Harbor Study and is aimed at maintaining existing service and improving safety at the Port Townsend Terminal.

If you have comments on the Port Townsend Terminal Preservation Project, you may send them to:
PortTownsendProject@wsdot.wa.gov

We will add you to the project e-mail database for both Keystone and Port Townsend to ensure that you will receive updates on both projects.

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg

COMMENT

Date: October 14, 2004
Author: Robin Adams
By: Email

Dear Sir,

In addition to my verbal comments at the meeting, I would like to make one other comment.

During the process of reducing the number of options to be considered to a more manageable number, the WSF spokesman invited the CAG to eliminate those options involving a 3 boat schedule in the longer-term. He stated that such an operation could not be accommodated in a single slip terminal like that at Keystone.

Although the CAG did not follow this suggestion, I wish to point out that the statement is not supported by the actual operating experience of WSF.

A 3 boat schedule on Keystone-Port Townsend implies the departure of a ferry every 30 minutes. This is the same departure frequency as that in place on the Mukilteo-Clinton route today. This route operates with a high degree of reliability on the basis of a single slip at Mukilteo.

Any 3 boat schedule for Keystone-Port Townsend would involve a vessel in the range of one half to two-thirds of the capacity of the Issaquah 130 vessels on the Mukilteo-Clinton run. This would reduce the vessel unloading and loading time. Therefore, the maintenance of a 3 boat schedule between Keystone and Port Townsend is actually less demanding and more practical than the present (reliable) service between Mukilteo and Clinton.

I ask you to place this comment in the record and draw it to the attention of the CAG.

Sincerely,
Robin Adams

WSF RESPONSE

Date: January 02, 2005
Author: Celia Schorr, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Dear Mr. Adams,

Thanks for your active participation in the Keystone Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) process. We appreciate the contributions you made at various CAG meetings and the written comments you submitted. Specifically, we are writing in response to the report you authored titled, "Does the Ferry System Really Need a New Dock?" This report was read by WSF staff, and several of us worked together (particularly in the planning, budget, and vessel and terminal engineering departments) to address many of the points you raised. Our comments are attached, in a report titled, "WSF Vessel Planning and Keystone Harbor Service Issues". Please read the attached report and let us know if you have any questions or comments.

We missed your presence at the final CAG meeting held on December 7th. I thought I would provide you with a brief status update:

The outcome of this process is a report due to the Legislative Transportation Committee on January 7, 2005. The report will summarize the results of the Keystone Harbor Study. As directed by the State Legislature, WSF studied a wide range of options for operating out of Keystone Harbor, including modifications to the harbor that would accommodate a larger vessel and vessels that could fit in the existing harbor without modifications. After looking at and considering a wide range of options with participation and input from the CAG, WSF selected four options to carry forward for further study.

- * Using a 130-car vessel, relocating the jetty, and widening the harbor to the east.

- * Using a 130-car vessel, extending the jetty, and widening the harbor to the west.

- * Building new vessels with specialized propulsion systems (assumed for this study to be 100-car sized vessel) for the Keystone-Port Townsend route and using the existing harbor and terminal.

- * Building 65-car "Keystone Special" vessels with the same footprint as the Steel Electrics and using the existing harbor and terminal.

The report will be put on the webpage as soon as it is released to the

Legislature.

Again, thanks very much for your contribution to this process. The thought you put into your comments is admirable.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to reach me at (206) 515-3918 or schorrc@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,
Celia Schorr
Washington State Ferries
Voice: 206-515-3918
Pgr: 206- 955-4263
Fax: 206-515-3404
schorrc@wsdot.wa.gov

ATTACHED: robin adams response - dec 2004.pdf>>

COMMENT

Date: January 03, 2005
Author: Robin Adams
By: Email

Dear Ms Schorr

Thank you for your paper, which I look forward to studying in more detail. I appreciate the work that WSF has done in preparing this response.

I am very pleased to see that WSF, while continuing to prefer the 130 car boat strategy, is willing to entertain the possibility of keeping the existing harbor and ordering boats that will fit into it, including those with new propulsion systems.

I am aware that WSF believes the 130 boat strategy to be more economical. However, I hope that all the options will be evaluated on a total lifetime cost basis using appropriate discount rates (which did not appear to be the case during the recent hearings). I also hope that WSF will conduct an economic risk analysis regarding the uncertainties surrounding traffic trends so that the option value associated with smaller boats can be properly understood. I did make an offer to Mr MacDonald to assist in this regard, but I suspect it has been overlooked as a result of the change in administration and the uncertainties surrounding the recent elections, which I suppose have delayed the nomination of new officials at the DOT and WSF.

Finally, I was disturbed at the obvious concern of the Captains regarding all of the Keystone options. You might remember that I suggested that WSF should send a small group of captains over to Scandinavia for a week or two to see some of these new designs in operation in practice. The winter would be an excellent time to do so given the lower activity in the WSF system and the demanding weather conditions in the Baltic. I do hope you will take up this suggestion, which has modest cost, since there really does appear to be a legitimate safety issue here as well.

I was sorry to miss the December meeting, but I had a business commitment in Colorado. It was not a lack of interest.

I am looking forward to seeing your legislative report.

COMMENT

Date: October 22, 2004
Author: Bill & Carol Viertel
By: Email

Here are my views on what should be done to improve/expand the Keystone terminal to allow larger ferries:

Return the small Keystone harbor to a near natural state.

This will improve the privacy of the campground at the foot of the slope coming down from Fort Casey S. P.

Relocate the terminal immediately to the other side of the boat ramp.

The little "park" associated with the boat ramp is nothing to write home about. It has no special or endearing qualities. If people want a park and beach experience, they can go to Fort Casey.

Preserving the boat ramp facility or building a new one at nearly the same site is important for boaters.

This would locate the new ferry terminal out of the restricted harbor but not objectionably closer to the homes farther down the beach. It could be, for example, in the location where the old rotting pier/pilings out in the water are located.

Route all incoming and exiting ferry traffic to Route 20, not via Camp Casey, Engle Road, and South Main Street.

Engle Road is part of the heart of Ebey's Landing Historical Reserve. As such, we should try as much as possible to keep the feel of it rural. Huge pulses of noisy traffic coming through multiple times a day are eroding that rural feeling. It is also a danger to the many youth athletic camps that take place at Camp Casey despite the low speed limit signs. The speed limit is frequently disobeyed, and we do not have enough police to patrol it during every ferry arrival.

Likewise, all that traffic coming through South Main Street on the way north clogs south Coupeville and really does not help the businesses in that area, since extremely few people stop. In addition, all that traffic and the schools in the south Coupeville area are not a good mix.

Those headed south on the island already take the Route 20 route.

Please note that this makes access to the Keystone terminal actually less convenient for me. Right now I am 5 minutes from the terminal. This would increase my access time to the terminal to at least 10 minutes via Wanamaker Road, but I think it is the right thing for Ebey's Reserve and Coupeville.

Respectfully,
William Viertel

WSF RESPONSE

Date: October 26, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Mr. Viertel,

Thank you for your comments. WSF is studying environmental and traffic impacts as part of its analysis of keeping the ferry terminal in Keystone Harbor. This information has also been reviewed by the Keystone CAG. I will add you to the project database to ensure you stay informed as the project moves forward and receive meeting announcements for the next CAG meeting.

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg

COMMENT

Date: October 23, 2004
Author: Karen Jeffers
By: Email

Greetings,

Please share the current public comments. Also, please let me know how to make comments.

I was planning on being at the meeting on the 28th. Please give plenty of notice regarding the next meeting.

Thank you,
Karen Jeffers

WSF RESPONSE

Date: October 26, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Ms. Jeffers,
Attached is a compilation of public comments that have been submitted to WSF regarding the Keystone Harbor Study. If you wish to submit written comments you may write WSF, Attn: Keystone Harbor Study, 201 2nd Ave, Seattle, WA 98101 or e-mail keystone-ptproject@wsdot.wa.gov.

We will send out an e-mail alert and post a meeting announcement on the project website when a new meeting date has been scheduled. For your reference, the site is:
http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/improvement_projects/ptkey/.

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg

Correction regarding the street address. Write to:
WSF
Attn. Keystone Harbor Study
2911 2nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98121-1012

My apologies,
Joy

COMMENT

Date: November 22, 2004
Author: Damon Holzer
By: Email

Hi,

I just wanted to say that the steel-electric ferries ROCK! Seriously, I love those vessels....you really can't beat the wrap-around side decks and the overall ambiance of those boats. The Issaquah and Sealath class may be efficient, but they are extremely boring boxes. I drive around (from Federal Way) to the Port Townsend ferry and our family's place on Whidbey Island just so I can embark on a no-wait journey, and ride on the steel-electrics. I know things change, and efficiency trumps nostalgia, but I remember (as a kid who loved the ferries) the good 'ol days of mismatched ferries on routes (remember the Kulshan, Vashon,

and Rhody on the Mulkilteo run?) Anyway, I hope if it's a close call between keeping the steel-electrics, and replacing them with something boring, you might think about letting them continue on the PT-Keystone route.

Sincerely,
Damon Holzer

WSF RESPONSE

Date: November 22, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Mr. Holzer,
I appreciate you taking the time to write WSF. I agree that the steel electrics have a certain charm; however, the 76-year old boats are the oldest ferries in the WSF fleet and are scheduled for retirement. These vessels have pre-World War II vintage car decks and riveted steel hulls, limited car and passenger carrying capacity, and they require significant capital investment in order to maintain safe operations.

We are presently conducting a technical analysis to determine the viability of operating out of the existing Keystone Harbor. WSF is preparing a study report to deliver to the Legislative Transportation Committee in January 2005. WSF is working with a Citizen Advisory Group to help guide the analysis.

The next meeting of the Keystone Citizen Advisory Group is scheduled for December 7 from 6-8:45pm at the Camp Casey Conference Center in Coupeville.

To learn more please visit the project webpage at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/projects/keystoneharbor>. (Note: The report date has been extended from December 04 to January 05 - we are in the process of updating the webpage. My apologies for any confusion)

Please call, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Joy Goldenberg

COMMENT

Date: December 12, 2004
Author: Steve Lea Family
By: Email

Hello;
We would like to know the out-come of the Tues-7th Meeting on the Keystone ferry run. We were unable to attend the meeting. What is the future hold?
Thank you in advance
The Steve Lea Family

WSF RESPONSE

Date: December 28, 2004
Author: Joy Goldenberg, WSF Customer and Community Relations
By: Email

Dear Steve Lea Family,

Thanks for contacting Washington State Ferries - I apologize for the delayed response. The December 7 meeting was the sixth and final meeting of the Keystone Citizen Advisory Group (CAG). The meeting materials are on the webpage located <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/projects/keystoneharbor> (see link in yellow box).

The outcome of this process is a report due to the Legislative Transportation Committee on January 7, 2005. The report will summarize the results of the Keystone Harbor Study. As directed by the State Legislature, WSF studied a wide range of options for operating out of Keystone Harbor, including modifications to the harbor that would accommodate a larger vessel and vessels that could fit in the existing harbor without modifications. After looking at and considering a wide range of options with participation and input from the CAG, WSF selected four options to carry forward for further study.

- Using a 130-car vessel, relocating the jetty, and widening the harbor to the east.
- Using a 130-car vessel, extending the jetty, and widening the harbor to the west.
- Building new vessels with specialized propulsion systems (assumed for this study to be 100-car sized vessel) for the Keystone-Port Townsend route and using the existing harbor and terminal.
- Building 65-car "Keystone Special" vessels with the same footprint as the Steel Electrics and using the existing harbor and terminal.

The report will be put on the webpage as soon as it is released to the Legislature.

Please contact me at 206-515-3411 or goldenj@wsdot.wa.gov, if you have further questions.

Thanks for your interest,
Joy Goldenberg
Washington State Ferries
2911 2nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98121
(206) 515-3411
cell (206) 713-7907
Fax (206) 515-3404
